IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. 553 of 1993

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KS JHAVERI

==========

1 Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2 To be referred to the Reporter or not ?

3 Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4 Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?

5 Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

STATE OF GUJARAT - Appellant(s)
Versus
VAGAD KANTILAL PUNJABHAI & 1 - Opponent(s)

==========

Appearance :
MR HL JANI APP for Appellant(s) : 1,
MR NITIN M AMIN for Opponent(s) : 1,
NOTICE NOT RECD BACK for Opponent(s) : 2,

==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KS JHAVERI

Date : 25/10/2007

ORAL JUDGMENT

1.0 It is stated at the bar that respondent no. 2 has expired on 14.09.1992 and, therefore, the appeal qua respondent no. 2 shall not survive. In that view of the matter, the appeal stands abated qua respondent no. 2 only. Hence, this appeal is

considered only qua respondent no. 1.

2.0 This appeal is directed against the judgment and order dated 30.01.1993 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamnagar in Criminal Case No. 37 of 1992 whereby, the respondents – accused persons were acquitted of the charges levelled against them.

3.0 The brief facts of the prosecution case are as under;

3.1 The complainant herein is the wife of respondent no. 1 while deceased respondent no. 2 was the mother of respondent no. 1. On 29.05.1990 the impugned complaint was filed against the respondents for offences punishable u/s. 498-A, 504 and 114 of the Indian Penal Code. On the said complaint, the Investigating Officer carried out necessary investigation and filed charge-sheet against the respondents. Ultimately, trial was conducted against the respondents.

3.2 In order to prove the guilt against the respondents, the prosecution has examined three witnesses namely, PW – 1 Kantaben Ramjibhai at Exhibit – 12, PW – 2 Malde Popat at Exhibit – 24 and PW – 3 Narayan Laxman at Exhibit – 25. At the end of trial, the learned Magistrate acquitted the respondents of the charges leveled against them. Hence, this appeal.

4.0 Heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the entire documents on record. The principles which

would govern and regulate the hearing of appeal by this Court against an order of acquittal passed by the trial Court have been very succinctly explained by the Apex Court in a catena of decisions. This Court has the power to re-consider the whole issue involved in the appeal, re-appraise the evidence and come to its own conclusion and findings in place of the findings recorded by the trial Court, if the said findings are against the weight of the evidence on record or, in other words, perverse.

5.0 In a recent decision of the Apex Court in the case of ***State of Goa v. Sanjay Thakran & anr. reported in (2007) 3 S.C.C. 755***, the Court has reiterated the powers of this Court in such cases. In Para-16 of the said decision, the Court has observed as under ;

> "16. From the aforesaid decisions, it is apparent that while exercising the powers in appeal against the order of acquittal the Court of appeal would not ordinarily interfere with the order of acquittal unless the approach of the lower Court is vitiated by some manifest illegality and the conclusion arrived at would not be arrived at by any reasonable person and, therefore, the decision is to be characterized as perverse. Merely because two views are possible, the Court of appeal would not take the view which would upset the judgment delivered by the Court below. However, the appellate Court has a power to review the evidence if it is of the view that the conclusion arrived at by the Court below is perverse and the Court has committed a manifest error of law and ignored the material evidence on record. A duty is cast upon the appellate Court, in such circumstances, to re-appreciate the evidence to arrive to a just decision

> on the basis of material placed on record to find out whether any of the accused is connected with the commission of the crime he is charged with".
>
> [*Emphasis supplied*]

6.0 Similar principle has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in two recent decisions in the cases of ***State of Uttar Pradesh v. Ram Veer Singh & ors.*** reported in ***2007 A.I.R. S.C.W. 5553*** and in ***Girja Prasad (Dead) by L.Rs. v. State of M.P.*** reported in ***2007 A.I.R. S.C.W. 5589***. Thus, the powers which this Court may exercise against an order of acquittal are well settled.

7.0 The trial Court has acquitted the respondents from the alleged offence in question mainly on the ground that the complaint in question was filed after almost eight years from the date when the alleged cruelty / torture was meted out to her. Apart from that, in her cross-examination, the complainant has admitted that for the last eight years prior to the filing of the impugned complaint, she was residing at her parental home. Keeping in mind the aforesaid factual aspect, it is highly unbelievable that the respondents are guilty of the alleged offence in question. Further more, no reasons have been assigned, much less even satisfactory, for the said delay of eight years caused in the filing of the impugned complaint.

8.0 In above view of the matter, I am of the opinion that the trial Court was completely justified in acquitting the respondents of

the charges levelled against them. In my view, the findings recorded by the trial Court are absolutely just and proper and in recording the said findings, no illegality or infirmity has been committed by it. I am in complete agreement with the findings, ultimate conclusion and the resultant order of acquittal recorded by the trial Court and, hence, find no reasons to interfere with the same.

9.0 I am not discussing the evidence of each witness/s in detail in view of the observations made by the Apex Court in the case of ***State of Karnataka Vs. Hemareddy*** reported in ***A.I.R. 1981 S.C. 1417*** wherein it is held as under:

> "... This court has observed in Girija Nandini Devi V. Bigendra Nandini Chaudhary (1967)1 SCR 93: (AIR 1967 SC 1124) that it is not the duty of the appellate court when it agrees with the view of the trial court on the evidence to repeat the narration of the evidence or to reiterate the reasons given by the trial court expression of general agreement with the reasons given by the Court the decision of which is under appeal, will ordinarily suffice."

10.0 In the result, the appeal is dismissed. Office is directed to send the Records & Proceedings of the case, if lying with this Court, to the trial Court concerned forthwith.

[K. S. Jhaveri, J.]

Pravin/*